

Serial No. 09/846,044, filed 5/1/01

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-16 and 20-28 are presently pending in the application. Claims 8-10 and 17-19 have been withdrawn, but would be allowable if the claims from which they depend are allowed. Claims 1 and 12 are in independent form. Claims 2 and 13 were previously cancelled, and claims 17-19 are cancelled by this Amendment.

A proposed amendment to Figure 1 is being submitted with this Amendment. The amendment shows the pulley 22 schematically supported for rotation by the bracket 24, which was originally shown in the informal drawings that were filed with the Specification. Lead lines and numbering are also corrected.

Claims 25 and 28 were rejected under §112, second paragraph for being indefinite. The prior unentered amendment to claims 25 and 28 would have overcome this rejection. With this amendment, Applicant is amending claims 23-25 and 28 in the same manner as the previously unentered amendment.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 25 were rejected under §102(b) over Miyauchi. Claim 1 now requires that one of the drive motor and/or the belt support the glass support member. This is not shown in Miyauchi, which shows the glass support member only supported by the guide 13 and not the drive motor 5 or the belt 20. The drive motor 5 and belt 20 are arranged remote from the glass support 10. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Miyauchi.

Claim 12, 14-16 and 24 were rejected under §102(b) over LeCompagnon. The Examiner argues that the panel is the element 30. Amended claim 12 requires that both the drive motor and the bracket, which supports an opposite portion of the belt from the drive motor, are supported by the panel. These limitations are not met by LeCompagnon since

Serial No. 09/846,044, filed 5/1/01

the drive motor is shown supported remotely from the panel 30. Accordingly, claim 12 is allowable for this reason. Claim 12 is additionally allowable because it recites protrusions, which are not disclosed in the LeCompagnon. The LeCompagnon recites a belt or chain 22 driven by a sprocket 36 (see column 3, lines 34-57). Protrusions are not disclosed by this reference.

Claims 1, 3-7, 11 and 23 were rejected under §103 over LeCompagnon in view of Colell. As noted above, LeCompagnon does not disclose the claimed protrusions. Furthermore, the stated motivation by the Examiner is not supported by the references. The Examiner argues the motivation to modify LeCompagnon with Colell would be "to prevent the belt from slipping with respect to the drive pulley." However, LeCompagnon discloses a chain sprocket arrangement. The chain would not slip from the sprocket and there is no teaching in the references to indicate otherwise. Accordingly, the motivation is improper and the rejection must be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 11, neither of the references disclose the claimed rod, nor does the Examiner provide any motivation for providing the claimed rod.

The rejection to claim 20 is improper for similar reasons as those argued above with respect to claim 1.


07/06/2005 WED 14:11 FAX 12489888363 Carlson, Gaskey & Olds

014/016

Serial No. 09/846,044, filed 5/1/01

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. If any fees or extensions of time are required, please charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1482.

Respectfully submitted,
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS


William S. Gottschalk
Registration No. 44,130
400 W. Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: April 11, 2005

N:\Clients\MERITOR\Files 1000 to 1500\IP01048\PATENT\Amendment 040605.doc